Table 3.4.3.1

PRINCEVILLE FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT PROJECT

FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVES

May 2008

Alternative Type	Alternative Symbol	Alternative Name	Description	Cost	Evaluation	Action
Without Project Alternative	WP	Future Without Project	Maintain existing conditions; no change to existing dike, structures, land or waters.	\$0	No cost burden, but existing threat of flooding would remain; community of national importance may not be sustainable.	This alternative does not promote a sustainable community in accordance with the Presidential Executive Order, nor does it comply with any one of the 12 Actions for Change.
Nonstructural Alternatives	NS-1	Floodproof Structures	Flood proof all residential and commercial structures to a level which would prevent damage from the 1% flood event.	approx. \$75-100 million	Due to depth of potential flooding, food proofing would be either impractical or infeasible for many of the buildings, and high cost would make it economically infeasible.	Screened out.
	NS-2	Elevate Structures	Raise all existing residential and commercial structures to elevations above level of the 1% flood event.	\$24 million minimum	Raising all structures above the 1% flood level would be economically infeasible and impractical due to the required raising heights. Access would also be impractical for many residents, who are of advanced age.	Screened out.
	NS-3	Relocate Entire Town	Relocate all residential and commercial structures to high ground outside the Tar River floodplain.	\$200-400 million	Wholesale relocation would be economically infeasible, and likely would be unacceptable to residents.	Screened out.
	NS-4	Buy Out Residents	Buyout of residents' property, requiring them to move to structures ouside the floodplain.	\$50-70 million	FEMA offered a buyout to residents in October 1999, which was rejected by the town council.	Screened out.
	NS-5	Flood Evacuation and Education Plans	Implement Flood Warning and Evacuation Plan and Flood Risk Management Education and Communication Plan.	\$60,000	These plans would provide reliable warning and evacuation procedures for residents of Princeville. They would also educate residents on their flood risks, and costs of mitigation of the residual risks.	Considered alternative.
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
ves	S-1	Build Ring Dike	Construct a dike around the entire town to prevent floodwaters from entering.	\$200 million	Difficult ingress and egress for residents. Severe interior drainage problems. Economically infeasible. Rejected by the town council.	Screened out.
	S-2	Construct Reservoirs	Construct reservoirs along the Tar River upstream of Princeville to retain floodwaters and prevent flooding in town.	\$100-300 million	Impractical to locate sites for the required reservoirs. Not likely to eliminate or even reduce Princeville flooding. Economically infeasible.	Screened out.
	S-3	Modify River Channel	Deepen and/or widen the existing Tar River channel to decrease floodwater levels.	not estimated	Infeasible due to critical environmental impacts, particularly the presence of the endangered Tar River Spinymussel. USFWS "jeopardy" opinion would halt the project.	Screened out.
	S-4	Modify Bridges	Modify the existing bridges at US 64 and Main street to reduce floodwater elevations upstream.	\$10-15 million	Projected water surface elevation reduction due to bridge modifications is minor and would provide only minimal benefit.	Screened out.
Iternati	S- 5	Construct Bypass Channel	Construct a high-flow channel to convey floodwaters around Princeville and reduce flooding within the town.	\$150-400 for land purchase and mitigation alone	Economically infeasible. Objection by the town.	Screened out.
Structural A	S- 6	Raise and Extend Existing Dike	Raise and extend the existing dike to decrease the level of flood risk.	\$40-50 million	Raising top of the existing dike would increase flood levels in Tarboro, and upstream of the dike, violating a constraint of the project.	Screened out.
	S-7		Extend the existing dike to block flanking floodwaters and decrease the level of flood risk to design level of existing dike.	\$12-25 million	Extension of the existing dike could prevent floodwaters from flanking the dike prior to overtopping, as happened during Hurricane Floyd. Improvement of FRM from 1.7% to 0.333%. Economically feasible.	Considered alternative.
	S- 8	Improve Interior Drainage	Install features that would allow reliable removal of stormwater runoff from low areas inside the dike.	\$5-10 million	Interior drainage features would take the form of pumps with a collection system. They would reduce flood damage to buildings from interior rainfall runoff accumulation.	Considered alternative.
	S- 9	Flood Measures for Water and Sewer Plants	Construct flood risk management measures at Tarboro water and wastewater treament plants.	?	Measures would decrease flood risk for the plants, to equal that of the existing dike. Would provide operational water and wastewater service up to the time of dike overtopping.	Considered alternative.

Table 3.4.3.2

PRINCEVILLE FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT PROJECT

POTENTIAL MEASURES FOR ALTERNATIVE S-7, EXTEND EXISTING DIKE

May 2008

an upstream measure(s). Would increase flood risk rille to 0.333%, to match that of the existing dike. Will ting dike would be overtopped.	Action Considered measure.
rille to 0.333%, to match that of the existing dike. Will	Considered measure.
	Considered measure.
ntal clearance between houses and existing highway to	Screened out.
om rear of houses: access to carports, entrances.	Considered measure.
No change to intersection; only 2 driveways to ramp.	Considered measure.
No change to intersection; no driveways to ramp.	Considered measure.
•	Considered measure.
sion would need to be raised for flood risk	Considered measure.
sion would need to be raised for flood risk	Considered measure.
	Considered measure.
스타 WeiN Me - '' TRING UND NORTH NORTH - '' TU 프라이크를 다 되는 기자를 다 되는 것이다. '' 하고 그리고 있다고 있는 모든 10 등은 UND UNES	Considered measure.
	equired for drive access. Most construction is on orderately extensive area of flood risk management ontal clearance between houses and existing highway to come rear of houses: access to carports, entrances. No change to intersection; only 2 driveways to ramp. No change to intersection; no driveways to ramp. enefit. No change to intersection; no driveways to see. In some needed. No extended area of flood risk asion would need to be raised for flood risk asion would need to be raised for flood risk asion would need to be raised for flood risk asion would need to be raised for flood risk asion would need to be raised for flood risk asion would need to be raised for flood risk asion would need to be raised for flood risk as modifications needed. Little extended area of flood xtensions would need to be raised for flood risk as modifications needed. Little extended area of flood xtensions would need to be raised for flood risk as modifications needed. Little extended area of flood xtensions would need to be raised for flood risk as modifications needed. Little extended area of flood xtensions would need to be raised for flood risk as modifications needed. Little extended area of flood xtensions would need to be raised for flood risk as modifications needed. Little extended area of flood xtensions would need to be raised for flood risk as modifications needed. Little extended area of flood xtensions would need to be raised for flood risk as modifications needed. Little extended area of flood xtensions would need to be raised for flood risk as modifications needed.